Remarks

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Thus, claims 1-6, 9-10, 20-25 and 27-28 have been cancelled; and claims 7-8, 11-14, 26 and 29-31 have been restricted in their scope.

Most of the amendments to the claims are self-explanatory. Applicants point out that the definitions for R¹ and R² in amended claim 7 represent the preferred definitions for these groups as disclosed at page 32, lines 2-4 of the specification.

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 20-25 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, as well as the objection to claims 23-25, in items 2 and 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, have been rendered moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

The rejections based on prior art in items 6-9 have been rendered moot in view of the cancellation/amendment of the rejected claims. Applicants take the position that the subject matter of the amended claims is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Lichtenhan et al. '075 or Lichtenhan et al. '193 references.

The rejection of claims 1-10 and 20-25 in item 10 has also been rendered moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

The rejection in item 11 has also been rendered moot in view of the amendments to the rejected claims. Applicants take the position that the Lichtenhan et al. '562 reference fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of the amended claims.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of objection and rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiro YOSHIDA et al.

For:

Amy E. Pulliam

Registration No. 55,965 Agent for Applicants

for

Michael R. Davis

Registration No. 25,134 Attorney for Applicants

MRD/pth Washington, D.C. 20006-1021 Telephone (202) 721-8200 Facsimile (202) 721-8250 April 27, 2005